

To: Bennett, Tate[Bennett.Tate@epa.gov]
Cc: Lyons, Troy[lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Ferguson, Lincoln[ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov]; Hupp, Millan[hupp.millan@epa.gov]; Jackson, Ryan[jackson.ryan@epa.gov]; Schwab, Justin[schwab.justin@epa.gov]; Brown, Byron[brown.byron@epa.gov]; Greenwalt, Sarah[greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov]; Fotouhi, David[fotouhi.david@epa.gov]
From: Dravis, Samantha
Sent: Thur 4/20/2017 4:14:05 AM
Subject: Re: Urgent for Greitens meeting-pesticide applicator revised rules

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 19, 2017, at 11:08 PM, Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov> wrote:

I wanted to flag that we just learned Gov. Greitens is going to bring the revised final pesticide applicator rule up. It is scheduled to go into effect in May after being extended from January 1. Went final in December. AFBF and NASDA have petitioned saying the final rule didn't follow the rule making process (see press release and link to petition below) and have requested a 1 year delay. Copying others to see if this has come up yet?

<http://www.fb.org/newsroom/farm-bureau-nasda-seek-delay-of-unlawful-epa-rule>

http://www.fb.org/files/WPS_Petition_Dec._21.pdf

“We ask EPA to delay the effective date to give NASDA members adequate time to prepare for compliance with the rule and to avoid the unfair and unredressable harm to farmers and ranchers,” the groups said.

The petition from AFBF and NASDA claims EPA did not meet the law’s requirements when it failed to provide congressional agriculture committees a final copy of the regulations along with the copy sent to the agriculture secretary. The EPA has acknowledged that omission in responses to questions from Congress.

“EPA’s failure to meet its statutory obligations deprived Congress of its lawful expectation of examining the regulation before its promulgation,” the petition states.

The groups also claimed that the rule’s “designated representative” provision exceeds the scope of the WPS rule by depriving farmers of reasonable expectation of privacy for confidential business information. The groups say that the rule subjects farmers to potential harassment and public criticisms for lawful use of EPA-approved pesticides. In spite of the groups identifying problems related to equity and implementation of the WPS rule, EPA has

not addressed the problems.

The petition also asserts that the EPA has failed to finalize and deliver to state lead agencies the enforcement guidance, educational material and training resources needed to effectively implement the rule and assist farmers and ranchers with compliance efforts.

“At this time, even if all of the compliance and enforcement materials were completed and distributed to all the appropriate state enforcement agencies, there is simply not enough time for the (state lead agencies) and the regulated community to successfully implement the provisions scheduled to take effect on January 1, 2017,” the petition states. “In short, EPA has failed to develop and deliver the necessary resources for states to train the regulated community on the new requirements, and the agency has failed to comply with its own WPS Implementation Timeline.”

<pesticides-pesticideapplicatorrule15a.1218.docx>

To: Lyons, Troy[lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Ferguson, Lincoln[ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov]; Hupp, Millan[hupp.millan@epa.gov]
Cc: Jackson, Ryan[jackson.ryan@epa.gov]; Dravis, Samantha[dravis.samantha@epa.gov]; Schwab, Justin[schwab.justin@epa.gov]; Brown, Byron[brown.byron@epa.gov]; Greenwalt, Sarah[greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov]
From: Bennett, Tate
Sent: Thur 4/20/2017 3:08:26 AM
Subject: Urgent for Greitens meeting-pesticide applicator revised rules
[pesticides-pesticideapplicatorrule15a.1218.docx](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)

I wanted to flag that we just learned Gov. Greitens is going to bring the revised final pesticide applicator rule up. It is scheduled to go into effect in May after being extended from January 1. Went final in December. AFBF and NASDA have petitioned saying the final rule didn't follow the rule making process (see press release and link to petition below) and have requested a 1 year delay. Copying others to see if this has come up yet?

<http://www.fb.org/newsroom/farm-bureau-nasda-seek-delay-of-unlawful-epa-rule>

http://www.fb.org/files/WPS_Petition_Dec._21.pdf

“We ask EPA to delay the effective date to give NASDA members adequate time to prepare for compliance with the rule and to avoid the unfair and unredressable harm to farmers and ranchers,” the groups said.

The petition from AFBF and NASDA claims EPA did not meet the law’s requirements when it failed to provide congressional agriculture committees a final copy of the regulations along with the copy sent to the agriculture secretary. The EPA has acknowledged that omission in responses to questions from Congress.

“EPA’s failure to meet its statutory obligations deprived Congress of its lawful expectation of examining the regulation before its promulgation,” the petition states.

The groups also claimed that the rule’s “designated representative” provision exceeds the scope of the WPS rule by depriving farmers of reasonable expectation of privacy for confidential business information. The groups say that the rule subjects farmers to potential harassment and public criticisms for lawful use of EPA-approved pesticides. In spite of the groups identifying problems related to equity and implementation of the WPS rule, EPA has not addressed the problems.

The petition also asserts that the EPA has failed to finalize and deliver to state lead agencies the enforcement guidance, educational material and training resources needed to effectively implement the rule and assist farmers and ranchers with compliance efforts.

“At this time, even if all of the compliance and enforcement materials were completed and distributed to all the appropriate state enforcement agencies, there is simply not enough time for

the (state lead agencies) and the regulated community to successfully implement the provisions scheduled to take effect on January 1, 2017,” the petition states. “In short, EPA has failed to develop and deliver the necessary resources for states to train the regulated community on the new requirements, and the agency has failed to comply with its own WPS Implementation Timeline.”

December 14, 2015

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

COMMENTS FOR SUBMISSION
DOCKET ID No. EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0183

These comments are submitted to the above-referenced docket on behalf of American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), the nation's largest general farm organization. AFBF represents ranchers and agricultural producers in all fifty states and Puerto Rico and our members are engaged in virtually every aspect of agricultural production, from livestock, fruits and vegetables to dairy and row crops. Many of our members utilize pesticide producers regulated under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and are certified pesticide applicators. As such, they will be directly affected by this proposal and any changes EPA makes to the rule governing certified pesticide applicators. We appreciate this opportunity to submit comments for the agency's consideration and respectfully request that they be taken into account as the agency refines its proposal.

IN GENERAL

AFBF acknowledges EPA's responsibility to assure that restricted use pesticides (RUPs) are handled safely and we support appropriate levels of training and certification of applicators of RUPs. AFBF policy specifically states that we support "periodic upgrading of EPA/state pesticide applicator training to ensure a sound and effective source of training, information and certification on the proper handling and safe use of pesticides." Thus, AFBF does not object in principle to the agency's review of the applicator certification rule, nor do we object to targeted improvements that are designed to address demonstrated shortcomings in the existing rule. We would value the opportunity to work collaboratively with the agency in implementing such improvements.

Unfortunately, the proposal the agency has put forward appears to go well beyond a reasonable approach and instead represents a wholesale revision of the existing rule. It broadly expands the requirements for individuals to become certified applicators, proposes extensive continuing education requirements (CEUs), codifies the period of certification, demands changes in state laws and regulations relating to state certification programs, expands the requirements for certification, and limits opportunities by proposing age limits on certain categories of applicators. While AFBF acknowledges that the agency has an obligation to assure that registered pesticides must be used without unreasonable adverse effects to human health or the environment, we are concerned that this proposal goes beyond this statutory principle. Based on interactions AFBF and our state members have had with state Departments of Agriculture, state lead agencies, other crop and commodity organizations and the registrant community, it is clear

the revisions the agency is proposing would impose tremendous burdens on farmers, on state departments of agriculture, on state lead agencies and on the extension service. Thus, while we acknowledge that the proposed rule may be well intended, we cannot support it as proposed. We urge that the agency withdraw the proposal and commit to a substantive process of engagement that can produce a proposal that is more reflect of real world conditions and the needs and demands of farmers and ranchers.

Despite the agency's assertions, AFBF is concerned that the economic and regulatory costs are understated and the benefits of the proposal are over-estimated. In fact, we expect that there will be a tremendous imposition of costs on multiple stakeholders with little or nothing to show for it.

Based on our evaluation, we urge EPA to withhold from moving forward on this proposed rule. Instead, we would recommend that the agency initiate a broad, comprehensive stakeholder engagement process that involves EPA, farmers, certified applicators, state departments of Agriculture and the extension service. We believe that such a group, working collectively and collaboratively, could craft a much more realistic and practical set of changes that will more effectively accomplish the agency's goals of increasing applicator competence and reducing undesirable pesticide exposures.

COSTS AND BENEFITS

EPA has made available in the docket a lengthy document (*Economic Analysis of Proposed Amendments to 40 CFR Part 171: Certification of Pesticide Applicators*) that purports to lay out the costs and benefits of its proposed changes to the applicator certification regulation, seemingly showing that the benefits of the proposal exceed the costs. AFBF believes that the agency has underestimated the costs to producers and, just as importantly, overstated claims about the benefits that will result.

In a number of instances in the Economic Analysis, EPA claims that the benefits of the rule will be substantial:

“EPA expects the proposed changes would result in benefits by reduced exposure to RUPs.”¹

“The estimates, however, do not quantify many real health benefits that may result from the rule, but for which sufficient data are not available to estimate the monetary value of these benefits.”²

“...the proposed changes would also be expected to reduce environmental damage associated with RUP use by reducing the incidents of RUP misuse and other errors.”³

“The main reason EPA expects the rule to prevent incidents like these is that raising the standards for initial certification and more frequent training would ensure that

¹ *Economic Analysis*, Chapter 6, page 1 [hereinafter titled EA]

² EA, page 9

³ EA, page 10

applicators and those under their supervision would more carefully follow pesticide label instructions, take proper care to prevent harm, and generally have a higher level of competency.”⁴

“These crop incidents typically involve applicator error that more frequent training on the importance of following label requirements would be able to prevent.”⁵

“Similarly, for field corn the average incident involved 238 acres. At 2013 yields and prices (158.8 bushels per acre (NASS, 2014a) and \$4.50 per bush (NASS, 2014b)), preventing the average incident could save revenue to the grower of up to \$170,000.”⁶

“The review of the SENOR-Pesticides data identified 100 cases that were preventable under the proposed revisions to the rule. ...EPA concludes that 70 to 85 percent of RUP incidents would be preventable or at least possibly avoidable through the proposed changes.”⁷

At the same time, the agency makes a number of statements that speak to purported benefits of the proposal:

EPA “is proposing a set of requirements that, in combination, is expected to achieve substantial benefits at minimum cost.”⁸

“The more frequently applicators receive training, the more likely they are retain the substance of the training and apply it on the job.”⁹

“The annual cost to private applicators would be about \$19.5 million or about \$40 per year per private applicator”¹⁰

“EPA estimates the quantified value of the 638 to 762 acute illnesses from RUP exposure per year that could be prevented by the rule to be between \$20.1 million and \$20.5 million per year”¹¹

“It is reasonable to expect that the qualitative benefits of the rule are more substantial. Although EPA is not able to measure the full benefits that accrue from reducing chronic exposure to pesticides, well-documented associations between pesticide exposure and certain cancer and non-cancer chronic health effects exist in peer-reviewed literature.”¹²

⁴ EA, page 13

⁵ EA, page 16

⁶ EA, page 16

⁷ EA, page 27

⁸ Federal Register, page 51363

⁹ *Ibid.*, page 51363

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, page 51365

¹¹ *Ibid.*, page 51365

¹² *Ibid.*, page 51366

“Overall, the weight of the evidence suggests that the proposed requirements would result in long-term health benefits to certified and noncertified applicators, as well as to bystanders and the public.”¹³

By its own admission, the agency is hindered in quantifying benefits because it states that pesticide exposures too often go unreported and, when health effects are present, they can often be ascribed to other conditions. We acknowledge that there may be under-reporting of incidents and exposure, but we believe this fact demands that the agency acknowledge up-front that it does not have the ability to estimate benefits of the rule. It does not justify unfounded assumptions or predictions – particularly when they can be used to mask very real costs to the regulated community. In short, the perspective taken by the agency allows it to inflate its benefit assessment without tethering that assessment to anything like real world conditions. This is a critical failing in the proposal; it should be acknowledged and not allow the agency to proceed on enunciating “benefits” that cannot be realistically identified (if they even exist).

AFBF raised similar objections when the agency proposed revisions to its Worker Protection Standard (WPS) rule; in our comments on that proceeding, we pointed out a large number of instances in which the agency stated that, while it was proposing changes to the rule, it could identify any benefits with such changes. Thus, we are concerned here at the statement that “EPA’s experience with the proposed amendments to 40 CFR part 170 significantly informs its effort to amend the current certification rule at 40 CFR part 171.”¹⁴

That anxiety plays a role in AFBF’s reluctance to support these proposed changes, despite our readiness to support effective revisions that will help promote safety for applicators and the environment. AFBF’s experience with EPA’s proposed (and now promulgated) changes to the WPS rule demonstrates that, unfortunately, the agency appears to base new regulations on little more than the aspiration that they will result in good things. We are witnessing this result now in EPA’s provision in the WPS to permit third-party ‘designated representatives’ to gain access to farm records when that access is nowhere linked to environmental or worker health and safety.

Similarly, in this proposed rule, EPA appears to want to include merely record keeping violations as part of criminal penalty prosecution. It is AFBF’s understanding that the Association of American Pesticide Control Officials (AAPCO) objects to this proposal. Similarly, AFBF strongly opposes this proposal. It is apparently another instance in which EPA has encouraged an adversarial approach to farm and worker health and safety. There is no justification for regarding record-keeping violations as criminal matters. We urge EPA to delete this provision from the proposal.

The EPA proposal, viewed in its entirety, may be a well-intentioned effort to update a regulation that is decades old and is in need of revision. We do not object to such an effort, but we cannot support the proposal as it currently stands. As mentioned earlier, we would be pleased to work with the agency cooperatively in a multi-stakeholder effort that is designed effort to identify shortcomings in the existing regulation and to fashion provisions that will remedy those shortcomings.

¹³ *Ibid.*, page 51366

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, page 51360

Below, we respond to specific questions posed by the agency in the proposal.

Should EPA consider adding points to or deleting points from the proposed private applicator competency standards? If so, what points and why?

AFBF recommends that EPA eliminate the proposed private applicator competency standards. It is our experience that, in large part, the existing regulation adequately covers private applicators and we do not agree with the agency's stance of "proposing a set of competency standards substantially parallel to the core standards for commercial applicators."¹⁵ The universe of private applicators is distinct from that of commercial applicators. We recommend that EPA respect that distinction in its regulations. We understand that the Pesticide Policy Coalition (PPC), a coalition of organizations of which AFBF is a member, similarly objects to this provision and we associate AFBF with PPC's comments.

Are the competencies necessary to protect pollinators adequately covered in the proposed competency standards for private applicators?

As a general matter, AFBF believes that the question of protections for specific species or pests are best dealt with in label instructions. We do not believe pollinator-specific concerns need to be covered in competency standards for pesticide applicators. We also note that EPA – with AFBF's support – is now engaged in promoting state managed pollinator protection plans, and that these state-based initiatives will support efforts to protect pollinators.

Please comment on the proposed structure of the non-exam option for private applicator certification.

As a general matter, AFBF believes the training option for private applicators should be thorough without being overly burdensome or time-consuming for private applicators, many of whom will be taking away time from their operations in order to participate. This is particularly the case for private applicators seeking re-certification who are already familiar with the topics to be covered. We encourage EPA not to adopt overly stringent requirements that will do little more than to inconvenience agricultural producers without resulting in any measurable benefit to applicators, workers or the environment.

Would the proposed categories adequately establish competency for the specified application methods?

Should EPA consider adding or deleting any of the proposed private applicator application method-specific certification categories? If so, which category(ies) and why?

AFBF has concerns that the approach proposed by EPA may be unnecessarily burdensome to private applicators and agricultural producers. EPA notes in its proposal that relatively few states currently have such method-specific requirements. While we acknowledge the importance of adequate training in soil and non-soil fumigation as well as aerial, it is our understanding that

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, page 51370

requirements for aerial application may already be well-covered by existing regulations. With respect to soil and non-soil fumigation, very few states (10 for soil and 8 for non-soil) have such requirements for private applicators. The agency's proposal would represent a wholesale change in the regulatory environment, potentially taxing educators and trainers without a sufficient justification. If the agency can identify instances in which a lack of private applicator training and education contributed to unacceptable risk, we believe there might be broader support for the proposal. In the absence of such a record, however, we do not support the agency's proposal as it currently stands. The PPC will be filing comments that note that private applicator training and competency is adequately met by current standards and AFBF agrees with that assessment.

Minimum Age

EPA has proposed setting a minimum age of 18 for certified applicators, as well as for noncertified applicators working under the direct supervision of certified applicators. AFBF notes that a number of states have decided on their own to set ages for these categories. AFBF supports the rights of states to decide this question and does not support an EPA-mandated minimum age level.¹⁶

Should EPA consider a different maximum recertification period? If so, what period and why?

AFBF strongly objects to an EPA-imposed national mandate on recertification periods for certified applicators. We believe this is an area best left to the states, which have shown a demonstrable commitment to assuring recertification is done promptly and responsibly. Mandating a federal 3-year recertification period will clearly increase burdens on the states and put a strain on educators and trainers. We strongly urge EPA not to mandate a re-certification period to the states and to allow states to continue operating in this sphere as they currently do.

Re-certification issues (Section XIV of the proposal).

EPA asks a series of question relating to the amount of training and CEUs that would be required, as well as when they would be required, for re-certification of applicators. AFBF strongly recommend that EPA not move forward with this proposal. While we believe the proposal fails on its own merits, we believe that judgment is reinforced when it is viewed – as it should be – in the context of other ongoing efforts to the agency.

EPA has just promulgated requirements for agricultural employers under the WPS that will require substantial commitments of time and expense. Coupled with those requirements are regulatory burdens the agency is seeking to impose related to greenhouse gases and jurisdictional

¹⁶ AFBF notes that EPA, in its proposal to establish age 18 as a minimum age for noncertified applicators working under the supervision of a certified applicator, states that it “cannot quantify the benefits associated with this proposal” and goes on to say that “it is reasonable to expect that this proposal would improve the health of adolescent noncertified applicators, as well as other bystanders and the environment.” While on its face the agency's assertion might seem reasonable, we believe there is sufficient amount of disagreement among states and the regulated community that would justify allowing each state to make this decision independent of a Federal mandate.

waters under the Clean Water Act. Here, EPA would be requiring increased core training/educational requirements; a new set of burdens related to method-specific requirements (soil fumigation, non-soil fumigation and aerial); higher levels of training; an increased burden of timing of training; and limiting opportunities for older youth to engage in agricultural employment.

The benefits this proposal would confer are disputable; the burdens and costs are real. Mandating a 3-year certification cycle, and coupling that with CEU requirements that must be accomplished within 18 months of re-certification imposes a harsh, inflexible regulatory burden on private applicators. We would note that these are real-world expenses imposed on individuals that are operating their farms and ranches year-round; it is not as though an individual forgets his or her training or allows it to lapse over a year and a half. We do not agree with the agency that this will result in any significant health or environmental benefit, yet we must note that it will take producers away from their operations for significant amounts of time, at significant expense, with much less flexibility than they have today. We urge the agency to drop these requirements from the proposed rule.

Furthermore, the agency is proposing to require that private applicator CEU programs require instruction in the general competency standards as well as each relevant application method-specific category. For private applicators, this will entail a demanding schedule of 6 CEUs of instruction to maintain core certification every 3 years and an additional 3 CEUs in the application-method specific categories every 3 years as well. EPA claims that the “more training applicators receive, the more likely they are to retain the substance of the training and apply it on the job.”¹⁷ EPA seems to be adopting advice from Mae West: “If a little is great, and a lot is better, then way too much is just about right!”

AFBF disagrees. We believe the agency has gone overboard in its proposal and should not move forward with it. We know of no stakeholder in the agricultural community that supports this approach and we believe the agency would be well served in abandoning it.

XV. State Certification Plan Requirements

As noted earlier, AFBF disagrees with EPA in its judgment that recordkeeping violation be subject to criminal penalties. We note that in the proposal, EPA states: “EPA has concerns that in the absence of either civil or criminal penalty provisions, a State would not have an adequate range of enforcement options and capabilities to respond appropriate to the wide range of pesticide misuse situations that could arise.”

With all due respect, the agency should not superimpose its own views on the states, which are the leaders in enforcing FIFRA and which are due as much respect as EPA. Agencies have plenary authority to adopt whatever mechanisms they deem suitable in their jurisdiction, and we believe the agency’s view is not borne out by the seriousness and vigor with which the states implement their responsibilities. We believe EPA should defer to the states in this area.

Definitions

¹⁷*Ibid.*, page 51390

As earlier noted, AFBF is a member of the Pesticide Policy Coalition (PPC). PPC is submitting comments to the docket that speak to problems in the agency's definition of certain terms, in particular "use" and "mishap." We agree with PPC's concerns about these definition terms and incorporate PPC's comments in that respect herein.¹⁸

We appreciate this opportunity to comment on the agency's proposal and stand ready to work with EPA in crafting a more reasonable and responsible rule that more appropriately balances the costs and benefits of the use of RUPs by certified applicators.

Sincerely,

¹⁸ With respect to the term "use," the PPC notes that the definition could be interpreted to include thousands of employees engaged in office secretarial work, pesticide sales, equipment maintenance, and a host of other roles not directly engaged in activities taken to implement RUP product label directions for use. PPC urges EPA to change the definition to clearly state that "use" only refers to activities identified in existing label language under directions for use. As part of that clarification, PPC urge EPA to remove the provision "arranging for the application of pesticides."

With respect to "mishap," PPC notes the rule's proposed definition of "mishap" as "an event that may adversely affect man or the environment and that is related to the use or presence of a pesticide, whether the event was unexpected or intentional." Such a definition differs from a similar definition for "accident" in the current version of 40 CFR 171, which is "an unexpected, undesirable event, caused by the use or presence of a pesticide that adversely affects man or the environment." The definition of "accident" requires that an adverse event occurred, while that of "mishap" only states an adverse event may have occurred. PPC urges that the definition of "mishap" in the proposed rule be deleted and its uses in the proposed rule be changed to "accident" as defined in 40 CFR 171.

To: Ferguson, Lincoln[ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov]
Cc: Ford, Hayley[ford.hayley@epa.gov]; Hupp, Millan[hupp.millan@epa.gov]
From: Bennett, Tate
Sent: Tue 11/21/2017 9:33:54 PM
Subject: For Michigan Materials- Revised One-Pager on WPS
Worker Protection Standard-C&T one pager.docx

To: Ferguson, Lincoln[ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov]
Cc: Hupp, Millan[hupp.millan@epa.gov]; Ford, Hayley[ford.hayley@epa.gov]; Kunding, Kelly[kunding.kelly@epa.gov]; McMurray, Forrest[mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov]; Gordon, Stephen[gordon.stephen@epa.gov]
From: Bennett, Tate
Sent: Tue 1/23/2018 12:35:32 AM
Subject: Re: Memo for Lunch Tomorrow

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

On Jan 22, 2018, at 7:10 PM, Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov> wrote:

Thanks. Forrest got this in the binder.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 22, 2018, at 7:06 PM, Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov> wrote:

Thank you Stephen.

Millan Hupp
Director for Scheduling and Advance
202.380.7561
hupp.millan@epa.gov

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 22, 2018, at 4:09 PM, Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov> wrote:

Shout out to Stephen who drafted it initially and did all the leg work.

Elizabeth Tate Bennett

Associate Administrator for Public Engagement & Environmental
Education

Office of the Administrator

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

(202) 564-1460

Bennett.Tate@epa.gov

<memo.Zippy Duvall Bio.docx>

To: Hupp, Sydney[hupp.sydney@epa.gov]; Hupp, Millan[hupp.millan@epa.gov]; Bowman, Liz[Bowman.Liz@epa.gov]; Graham, Amy[graham.amy@epa.gov]
From: Bennett, Tate
Sent: Thur 5/11/2017 4:51:47 PM
Subject: FW: NASDA Commends EPA for Extending Timeline on Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule
[CTRule_05112017.pdf](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)

Reading Binder?

From: Dudley Hoskins [mailto:Dudley@nasda.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2017 12:49 PM
To: Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>; Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>
Cc: Amanda Culp <Amanda@nasda.org>
Subject: Fwd: NASDA Commends EPA for Extending Timeline on Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule

In case you didn't already receive --

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Amanda Culp <Amanda@nasda.org>
Date: May 11, 2017 at 12:15:11 PM EDT
Subject: NASDA Commends EPA for Extending Timeline on Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: May 11, 2017

Contact:

Amanda Culp

Director, Communications

(202) 296-9680

amanda@nasda.org

NASDA Commends EPA for Extending Timeline on Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule

Following the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) announcement today of their 12-month extension of implementation of the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rule changes, NASDA CEO Dr. Barbara P. Glenn issued the following statement:

“We greatly appreciate EPA extending the effective date of this rule. While we are generally supportive of the improved final rule released in January, States are facing a range of on-going logistical, resource, and capacity challenges. These challenges are amplified as states work to implement other recent EPA requirements, such as the Worker Protection Standard. Extending the certification timeline will help alleviate some of those challenges by allowing states to work with our EPA partners to ensure adequate training resources and compliance assistance activities are in place to ensure we educate before we regulate.”

NASDA's comments on EPA's proposed rule can be found [here](#). NASDA is a nonpartisan, nonprofit association which represents the elected and appointed commissioners, secretaries, and directors of the departments of agriculture in all fifty states and four U.S. territories. NASDA grows and enhances agriculture by forging partnerships and creating consensus to achieve sound policy outcomes between state departments of agriculture, the federal government, and stakeholders. Learn more about NASDA at www.nasda.org.

###

Contact:
Amanda Culp
Director, Communications
(202) 296-9680
amanda@nasda.org

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
May 11, 2017

NASDA Commends EPA for Extending Timeline on Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule

Following the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) announcement today of their 12-month extension of implementation of the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rule changes, NASDA CEO Dr. Barbara P. Glenn issued the following statement:

"We greatly appreciate EPA extending the effective date of this rule. While we are generally supportive of the improved final rule released in January, States are facing a range of on-going logistical, resource, and capacity challenges. These challenges are amplified as states work to implement other recent EPA requirements, such as the Worker Protection Standard. Extending the certification timeline will help alleviate some of those challenges by allowing states to work with our EPA partners to ensure adequate training resources and compliance assistance activities are in place to ensure we educate before we regulate."

NASDA's comments on EPA's proposed rule can be found [here](#). NASDA is a nonpartisan, nonprofit association which represents the elected and appointed commissioners, secretaries, and directors of the departments of agriculture in all fifty states and four U.S. territories. NASDA grows and enhances agriculture by forging partnerships and creating consensus to achieve sound policy outcomes between state departments of agriculture, the federal government, and stakeholders. Learn more about NASDA at www.nasda.org.

###



National Association of State Departments of Agriculture
4350 North Fairfax Drive
#910
Arlington, VA 22203
Tel: 202-296-9680
www.nasda.org

To: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
From: Hupp, Millan
Sent: Thur 5/11/2017 5:55:51 PM
Subject: FW: NASDA Commends EPA for Extending Timeline on Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule
[CTRule_05112017.pdf](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)

From: Bennett, Tate
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2017 12:52 PM
To: Hupp, Sydney <hupp.sydney@epa.gov>; Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>; Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>; Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: NASDA Commends EPA for Extending Timeline on Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule

Reading Binder?

From: Dudley Hoskins [<mailto:Dudley@nasda.org>]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2017 12:49 PM
To: Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>; Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>
Cc: Amanda Culp <Amanda@nasda.org>
Subject: Fwd: NASDA Commends EPA for Extending Timeline on Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule

In case you didn't already receive --

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Amanda Culp <Amanda@nasda.org>
Date: May 11, 2017 at 12:15:11 PM EDT
Subject: NASDA Commends EPA for Extending Timeline on Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: May 11, 2017

Contact:

Amanda Culp

Director, Communications

(202) 296-9680

amanda@nasda.org

NASDA Commends EPA for Extending Timeline on Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule

Following the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) announcement today of their 12-month extension of implementation of the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rule changes, NASDA CEO Dr. Barbara P. Glenn issued the following statement:

“We greatly appreciate EPA extending the effective date of this rule. While we are generally supportive of the improved final rule released in January, States are facing a range of on-going logistical, resource, and capacity challenges. These challenges are amplified as states work to implement other recent EPA requirements, such as the Worker Protection Standard. Extending the certification timeline will help alleviate some of those challenges by allowing states to work with our EPA partners to ensure adequate training resources and compliance assistance activities are in place to ensure we educate before we regulate.”

NASDA's comments on EPA's proposed rule can be found [here](#). NASDA is a nonpartisan, nonprofit association which represents the elected and appointed commissioners, secretaries, and directors of the departments of agriculture in all fifty states and four U.S. territories. NASDA grows and enhances agriculture by forging partnerships and creating consensus to achieve sound policy outcomes between state departments of agriculture, the federal government, and stakeholders. Learn more about NASDA at www.nasda.org.

###

NEWS RELEASE

Contact:
 Amanda Culp
 Director, Communications
 (202) 296-9680
amanda@nasda.org

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
 May 11, 2017

NASDA Commends EPA for Extending Timeline on Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule

Following the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) announcement today of their 12-month extension of implementation of the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rule changes, NASDA CEO Dr. Barbara P. Glenn issued the following statement:

"We greatly appreciate EPA extending the effective date of this rule. While we are generally supportive of the improved final rule released in January, States are facing a range of on-going logistical, resource, and capacity challenges. These challenges are amplified as states work to implement other recent EPA requirements, such as the Worker Protection Standard. Extending the certification timeline will help alleviate some of those challenges by allowing states to work with our EPA partners to ensure adequate training resources and compliance assistance activities are in place to ensure we educate before we regulate."

NASDA's comments on EPA's proposed rule can be found [here](#). NASDA is a nonpartisan, nonprofit association which represents the elected and appointed commissioners, secretaries, and directors of the departments of agriculture in all fifty states and four U.S. territories. NASDA grows and enhances agriculture by forging partnerships and creating consensus to achieve sound policy outcomes between state departments of agriculture, the federal government, and stakeholders. Learn more about NASDA at www.nasda.org.

###



National Association of State Departments of Agriculture
 4350 North Fairfax Drive
 #910
 Arlington, VA 22203
 Tel: 202-296-9680
www.nasda.org

To: Kunding, Kelly[kunding.kelly@epa.gov]
From: Hupp, Millan
Sent: Tue 11/21/2017 10:12:23 PM
Subject: Fwd: For Michigan Materials- Revised One-Pager on WPS
Worker Protection Standard-C&T_one pager.docx
ATT00001.htm

Here you go!

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Bennett, Tate" <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>
Date: November 21, 2017 at 4:33:54 PM EST
To: "Ferguson, Lincoln" <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>
Cc: "Ford, Hayley" <ford.hayley@epa.gov>, "Hupp, Millan" <hupp.millan@epa.gov>
Subject: For Michigan Materials- Revised One-Pager on WPS